



CLIFFORD CHANCE US
31 WEST 52ND STREET
NEW YORK, NY 10019-6131

COPY MAILED

OCT 12 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Brad Pivar et al
Application No. 09/943,670
Filed: August 31, 2001
Attorney Docket No. 7207-211

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed September 22, 2005, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply within the meaning of 37 CFR 1.113 in a timely manner to the final Office action mailed January 4, 2005, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three (3) months. A reply under 37 CFR 1.113 is limited to an amendment that *prima facie* places the application in condition for allowance or a Notice of Appeal (and appeal fee required by 37 CFR 1.17(b)). Since the amendment submitted on July 6, 2005 did not *prima facie* place the application in condition for allowance as noted in the Advisory Action mailed July 21, 2005. Therefore, as no Notice of Appeal (and appeal fee), Request for Continued Examination (RCE) or a continuing application was timely filed. A three (3) month extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) was obtained. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on July 5, 2005.

The petition satisfies the conditions for revival pursuant to the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that (1) the reply in the form of a Request for Continued Examination (RCE); (2) the petition fee; and (3) the required statement of unintentional delay have been received. Accordingly, the reply to the final Office action of January 4, 2005 is accepted as having been unintentionally delay.

It is not apparent whether the person signing the statement of unintentional delay was in a position to have firsthand or direct knowledge of the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue. Nevertheless, such statement is being treated as having been made as the result of a reasonable inquiry into the facts and circumstances of such delay. See 37 CFR 10.18(b) and Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53178 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 103 (October 21, 1997). In the event that such an inquiry has not been made, petitioner must make such an inquiry. If such inquiry results in the discovery that it is not correct that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

There is no indication that the person signing the instant petition was ever given a power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. If the person signing the instant petition desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney or authorization of agent must be submitted. While a courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the person signing the instant petition, all future correspondence will be directed to the address of currently of record until such time as appropriate instructions are received to the contrary.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to Wan Laymon at (571) 272-3220.

This matter is being referred to Technology Center AU 2165.


Wan Laymon

Petitions Examiner

Office of Petitions

Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy

cc: SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL
P.O. BOX 061080
WACKER DRIVE STATION
SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080